

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001	03 MDL 1570 (GBD) (SN) ECF Case
---	------------------------------------

This document relates to:

Ashton et al. v. al Qaeda Islamic Army, et al., 02-cv-6977 (GBD)(SN)

Ashton Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Judgments Against the Taliban and Muhammad Omar

For the reasons set forth below, the statements contained in the declaration of Andrew J. Maloney, III, Esq. (“Maloney Declaration” or “Maloney Decl.”) and the record in this case, those plaintiffs in the above-captioned *Ashton* matter who are represented by Kreindler & Kreindler LLP¹ and are listed in the exhibits to the Maloney Declaration (“*Ashton Plaintiffs*”) respectfully move for an Order for final judgments for their losses and injuries arising out of the deaths of those individuals listed in the exhibits, all of whom were murdered in the September 11, 2001 Terrorist Attacks. They previously obtained a default liability judgment against, among others, the Taliban and the founder and former leader of the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan Emir Muhammad Omar (hereinafter the “*Taliban and Omar Defendants*”) and now move for the damages. They seek an Order:

1. Awarding each estate of the individuals killed in the September 11 Terrorist Attacks listed in Exhibits A-1 and A-2 to the Maloney Declaration (the “*Ashton 9/11 Decedents*”) damages for conscious pain and suffering against the *Taliban and Omar Defendants* in the amount of \$2,000,000 per decedent, which is the same amount this Court previously awarded to them in the action against Iran;

¹ The *Ashton* complaints include plaintiffs represented by non Kreindler & Kreindler counsel. Those counsel may file similar motions for final judgments against the Taliban.

2. Awarding each estate of the *Ashton* 9/11 Decedents listed in Exhibits A-1 and A-2 to the Maloney Declaration damages for economic loss against the *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants based on the same amounts that this Court awarded to those estates in the action against Iran;

3. Awarding each of the immediate family members of the *Ashton* 9/11 Decedents listed in Exhibits B-1 and B-2 (who are each named individually in the complaints underlying the relevant default judgment) solatium damages in the same amounts that this Court has previously awarded to those immediate family members in the action against Iran;

4. Awarding those *Ashton* Plaintiffs identified on Exhibits A-1 and B-1 who have asserted claims under the Anti-Terrorism Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2333, treble damages;

5. Awarding these plaintiffs pre-judgment interest at the rate of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually for the period from September 11, 2001 until the date of the judgment for damages;

6. Granting the *Ashton* Plaintiffs permission to seek punitive damages, economic damages, to the extent not sought herein, and other appropriate damages at a later date; and

7. Granting permission for all other plaintiffs in this action not appearing on the exhibits to the Maloney Declaration to submit applications for damages awards in later stages, to the extent such awards have not previously been addressed.

As the awards set forth in the proposed order represent the only direct recovery by the *Ashton* Plaintiffs against the *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants, the proposed order would constitute final awards and judgments against the *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants for the *Ashton* Plaintiffs.

I. Procedural Background

On September 4, 2002, the *Ashton* Plaintiffs filed their first complaint against the alleged sponsors of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, which included claims against defendants al

Qaeda Islamic Army, the Taliban and Muhammad Omar, among others. *See* 02-cv-6977 (S.D.N.Y.) ECF 1.² That complaint was consolidated and amended several times. *See, e.g.*, 02-cv-6977 (S.D.N.Y.) ECF 2, 11, 32, 38, 111, 465.³

In their complaints, the *Ashton* Plaintiffs, both United States nationals and non-nationals, asserted federal jurisdiction against the *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants pursuant to, among other things, the Alien Tort Statute (28 U.S.C. § 1330) (“ATS”), the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (28 U.S.C. § 1605(a)(7)) (“FSIA”) and the Torture Victim Protection Act (28 U.S.C. § 1330 note) (“TVPA”). *See, e.g.* 02-cv-6977, ECF 465 at ¶¶ 2-3, 10-12.

The causes of action asserted against the *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants, among others, were based on state law (Counts One through Four), the Anti-Terrorism Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2333 (“ATA”) (Count Five) and the TVPA (Count Five). *See, e.g.* 02-cv-6977, ECF 465 at ¶¶ 464-466, 469-70, 473-74, 477-78, 481-82, 486-89. Under the Anti-Terrorism Act, only a plaintiff who is a “national of the United States injured … by reason of an act of international terrorism, or his or her estate, survivors, or heirs, may sue … and shall recover threefold the damages he or she sustains … .” 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a).

Included in these counts were claims for wrongful death damages (economic loss and pain and suffering, among other things), personal injuries (both physical and mental), and solatium losses (along with loss of consortium, loss of support, loss of society and companionship, loss of parental care and guidance, and more). *Id.*

² References to MDL docket entries found at 03-md-1570 (S.D.N.Y.) are noted only by ECF number; references to individual civil case docket entries are preceded by the case number.

³ In a Case Management Order, this Court set forth a process for adding plaintiffs by listing their names and filing as supplemental pleadings under Fed.R.Civ.P. 15(d) and ordering that “[p]laintiffs added by this procedure need not re-serve defendants who have already be served.” ECF 247 at ¶ 12.

This Court issued an order authorizing service of process by publication on certain defendants, including the *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants. ECF 445 at 1, 8, 11. The *Ashton* Plaintiffs, and others, served the *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants by publication with verification of publication filed on March 16, 2005 and March 31, 2005. ECF 709, 735; Maloney Decl. at ¶ 5.⁴ The *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants never answered and the *Ashton* Plaintiffs thereafter moved for a Certificate of Default and a default judgment, which this Court granted on May 12, 2006. ECF 1782 *et seq.*, 1797 (referring to the defendants listed in Exhibit B to the *Ashton* Plaintiffs motion, including the *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants); Maloney Decl. at ¶ 5 and Exhibits C and D (listing the plaintiffs and defendants for and against whom, respectively, a default liability judgment was sought).⁵

Previously, in connection with their claims against the Islamic Republic of Iran (“Iran”), another defendant in the complaints naming the *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants, this Court granted the *Ashton* Plaintiffs a default liability judgment. ECF 3014. Thereafter, in connection with the damages assertions set forth in the *Ashton* complaints, in a series of orders this Court issued final damages judgments against Iran, granting the *Ashton* Plaintiffs’ motions for:

- Compensatory damages for the conscious pain and suffering of the *Ashton* 9/11 Decedents (*e.g.*, ECF 3226, 3229);

⁴ The publication notices directed the named defendants to the MDL docket and advised them in both English and Arabic that they were required to answer the complaints on that docket, which sought, among other things, compensatory, treble and punitive damages, within 60 days. ECF 709 at 2; 735 at 2. The jurisdictional and factual allegations against the *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants as set forth in the operative complaint at the time of service did not change in subsequent amendments. *Compare* 02-cv-6977 (S.D.N.Y.) (*Ashton* Consolidated Master Complaint, Filed 03/06/2003), ECF 11 at ¶¶ 2, 10-12, 112-14, 178-79, 600, 602-03, 605-06, 608-09, 610-12, 615-19 *with* 02-cv-6977 (S.D.N.Y.) (Sixth Amended Complaint, Filed 09/03/2005) ECF 465 at ¶¶ 2, 10-12, 78-79, 123-25, 464-66, 469-70, 473-74, 477-78, 481-82.

⁵ This Court entered a default liability judgment on May 12, 2006, stating that it applied to all claims, plaintiffs and defendants up to and through the Sixth Amended Complaint. ECF 1797.

- Economic damages for the estates the *Ashton* 9/11 Decedents (e.g., ECF 3296, 3300, 3394, 3387, 5846, 5926); and
- Solatium damages for immediate family members (and their functional equivalents) of the *Ashton* 9/11 Decedents (e.g. ECF 3396, 3300, 3387, 3394, 3706, 3979, 4052, 4106, 4152, 4170, 4497, 4880, 4902, 5101, 5145, 5920, 5947, 5950, 5976, 7170, 7172, 7190).

The *Ashton* Plaintiffs listed in the Exhibits to the Maloney Declaration now move this Court to grant the proposed Order awarding them damages for, as noted on those exhibits, conscious pain and suffering, economic loss and solatium losses arising out of the deaths of those individuals killed in the September 11 Terrorist Attacks in the same amounts as awarded previously to them. Maloney Decl. at ¶¶ 10-16. They also seek treble damages under the Anti-Terrorism Act for United States nationals whose claim for such damages this Court has jurisdiction to consider (see 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a) and Maloney Declaration Exhibits A-1 and B-1) and directing that pre-judgment interest be assessed at 4.96 percent per annum.

The *Ashton* Plaintiffs are set forth in the exhibits as follows:

- Exhibits A-1 (U.S. nationals) and A-2 (non U.S. nationals or nationality unconfirmed), asserting damages claims for the estates of those individuals killed in the Sept. 11 Terrorist Attacks; and
- Exhibits B-1 (U.S. nationals) and B-2 (non-U.S. nationals or nationality unconfirmed), asserting claims for solatium damages of those immediate family members listed in the Sixth Amended Complaint (or earlier), which was the operative pleading at the time this Court issued a liability judgment against the *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants.

The *Ashton* Plaintiffs also ask for permission to continue to submit applications in subsequent stages on behalf of those claimants not included in the attached exhibits, should any other applications be warranted.

II. Damages

The *Ashton* Plaintiffs claimed jurisdiction and damages, as relevant here, pursuant to the ATA's civil damages provision, the TVPA, the FSIA and state law. *See, e.g.*, 02-cv-6977

(S.D.N.Y.), ECF 465 at ¶¶ 463-90. They sought treble damages under the ATA, which applies to claims brought by United States nationals. 02-cv-6977 (S.D.N.Y.), ECF 465 at ¶ 479, 242.

According to the caselaw governing terrorism litigation, the “estates of those who [died] can recover economic losses stemming from wrongful death of the decedent; family members can recover solatium for their emotional injury; and all plaintiffs can recover punitive damages.” *Valore v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 700 F.Supp.2d 52, 83 (D.D.C. 2010) (concerning damages under FSIA); *Ests. of Ungar ex rel. Strachman v. Palestinian Auth.*, 304 F. Supp. 2d 232, 267 (D.R.I. 2004) (finding that under ATA plaintiffs can recover “both pecuniary damages … and also for non-economic damages, including loss of companionship, society, and mental anguish experienced by the victim's surviving family members, including his siblings … .”); *see also Miller v. Arab Bank, PLC*, 372 F. Supp. 3d 33, 41 (E.D.N.Y. 2019) (ruling that plaintiffs were entitled to solatium damages under the ATA); *Lelchook v. Commerzbank AG*, 2011 WL 4087448, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 2, 2011) (allowing plaintiffs to pursue claims for solatium damages is consistent with Congress’s incorporation of traditional tort-law principles, under which such damages are available, into the ATA.); *Smith ex rel. Smith v. Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan*, 262 F. Supp. 2d 217, 240 (S.D.N.Y. 2003) (while punitive damages are not available under ATA, its civil action provision “provides for treble damages”).

Though a claim under the FSIA is available only to a “claimant or … victim [who] was … a national of the United States; a member of the armed forces; or otherwise an employee of the Government of the United States, or of an individual performing a contract awarded by the United States Government, acting within the scope of the employee’s employment,” and the same is true with respect to the ATA, under the Alien Tort Statute, which was another source of jurisdiction the *Ashton* Plaintiffs asserted, district courts have authority to hear claims brought against non-sovereign defendants by both U.S. nationals and non-U.S. nationals. *See* 28 U.S.C. §

1350. Further, the ATA (for U.S. nationals) and state law remedies (for U.S. nationals and non-U.S. nationals) also provide remedies against a non-sovereign defendant for those killed or injured in an attack in the U.S.

A. Economic Damages

Economic damages are specifically contemplated in terrorism litigation, whether under the FSIA, the ATA or otherwise. The economic damages provision is “designed to compensate [a] decedent’s heirs-at-law for economic losses which result from [the] decedent’s premature death.” *Flatow v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 999 F. Supp. 1, 27 (D.D.C. 1998); *see also Ungar*, 304 F.Supp.2d at 264-65 (its legislative history “indicates that the ATA was to be construed broadly” and giving weight to its co-sponsor’s statement that the ATA “empowers victims with all the weapons available in civil litigation,”” suggesting “that Congress intended that the full range of damages should be available to persons entitled to bring actions pursuant to § 2333(a).”) (emphasis in original). Accordingly, “the beneficiaries of each decedent’s estate [are] ... entitled to recover the present value of economic damages, including lost wages that the decedents might reasonably have been expected to earn but for their wrongful deaths.” *Valore*, 700 F. Supp. 2d at 81-82, citing *Heiser v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 466 F.Supp.2d 229 (D.D.C. 2006.) Thus, sponsors of terrorist attacks that kill victims are routinely “liable for the economic damages caused to decedents’ estates.” *Roth v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 78 F. Supp. 3d 379, 399-400 (D.D.C. 2015), quoting *Valore*, 700 F.Supp.2d at 78.

Those *Ashton* Plaintiffs set forth in Exhibits A-1 and A-2 are all representatives of estates of victims who were murdered on September 11, 2001 (*Ashton* 9/11 Decedents) and claims on behalf of the *Ashton* 9/11 Decedents are asserted by those estate representatives. Maloney Decl. at ¶ 8. As liability has been established against the *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants, those moving plaintiffs now seek a final order of damages in the amounts set forth on Exhibits A-1 and A-2.

Previously, this Court awarded economic damages against co-tortfeasor Iran for the “economic losses stemming from the wrongful death of the decedent[.]” ECF No. 2623 at 2-3. In doing so, it adopted the economic loss calculations set forth in the plaintiffs’ economic expert reports. Maloney Decl. at ¶ 11; *see also* ECF 5535, 5537, 5881, 5671-73, 6646-48 (updated reports supporting economic loss motions). For those *Ashton* 9/11 Decedents on Exhibits A-1 and A-2 for whom economic damages are sought, the economic loss amount was calculated based on updated, present-value figures of either the economic damages previously provided by an economic expert or generated by the September 11 Victim Compensation Fund (“VCF”) and this Court previously found that those economic damages amounts were proper. Maloney Decl. at ¶ 11; *see also* ECF 5926, 5846, 7170 (orders crediting those reports).⁶

Accordingly, the *Ashton* Plaintiffs now respectfully request that this Court order economic loss awards to those the estates listed in Exhibits A-1 (trebled pursuant to the ATA for U.S. nationals) and A-2 (not trebled) in the amounts set forth therein.

B. Conscious Pain and Suffering

Plaintiffs identified in Exhibits A-1 and A-2 are all estates of *Ashton* 9/11 Decedents, who were murdered in the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and who all experienced the agonizing suffering prior to their deaths that has previously formed the basis of pain and suffering damages awards. Maloney Decl. at ¶¶ 8- 10; ECF 2618 at 7 – 9. Accordingly, the *Ashton* Plaintiffs now respectfully request that this Court grant those *Ashton* 9/11 Decedents whose estates are set forth in Exhibits A-1 and A-2 total compensatory damages judgment that reflects the previously awarded \$2,000,000 for each 9/11 Decedent, with that amount trebled

⁶ In some cases, because of long delays in production of economic loss materials, the Estates of the *Ashton* 9/11 Decedents are currently seeking only damages for conscious pain and suffering and will move for economic damages as soon as supporting materials are received.

pursuant to the ATA for the estates of U.S. nationals listed in Exhibit A-1. That total final damages amount for each *Ashton* 9/11 Decedent is listed in Exhibits A-1 and A-2.

C. Solatium Damages

“Acts of terrorism are by their very definition extreme and outrageous and intended to cause the highest degree of emotional distress.” *Belkin v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 667 F. Supp. 2d 8, 22. Reflecting the nature of terrorist attacks, which are intended to cause emotional damages to those closest to the physically injured party, family members of the decedents may recover for “the mental anguish, bereavement, and grief that those with a close relationship to the decedent experience as a result of the decedent’s death, as well as the harm caused by the loss of decedent’s society and comfort.” *Dammarell v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 281 F. Supp. 2d 105, 196 (D.D.C. 2003) (solatium damages available under FSIA), *vacated on other grounds*, 404 F. Supp. 2d 261 (D.D.C. 2005); *Ungar*, 304 F.Supp.2 at 264-65 (fullest range of damages should be available to plaintiffs in terrorism litigation, including “all the weapons available in civil litigation”); *Lelchook*, 2011 WL 4087448, at *2 (plaintiffs may “ ‘pursue claims for solatium [emotional] damages’ under the ATA” (brackets in original)); *Henkin v. Kuveyt Turk Katilim Bankasi*, 495 F.Supp. 3d 144, 152 (E.D.N.Y. 2020) (“[c]ourts permit “[p]laintiffs to pursue claims for solatium [emotional] damages” under the ATA.”) *citing Lelchook*, 2011 WL 4087448, at *2.

To this end, “[s]pouses and relative[s] in direct lineal relationships are presumed to suffer damages for mental anguish[.]” *Knox v. Palestine Liberation Org.*, 442 F. Supp. 2d 62, 78 (S.D.N.Y. 2006); *Morris*, 415 F.Supp.2d 1323, 1337 (D.Utah 2006) (holding that “victim’s family may recover under § 2333 for the victim’s lost wages and pain and suffering, and for the victim’s wife and children’s loss of companionship, society, and guidance, and mental anguish”); *Ungar*, 304 F. Supp 2d at 267 (holding plaintiffs entitled under § 2333 to economic and non-

economic damages, including loss of companionship and society, and mental anguish experienced by the victim's surviving family members).

Solatium claims have been treated as comparable to claims for intentional infliction of emotional distress, in which the immediate family members of the decedent are treated as direct victims. *See, e.g., Salazar v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 370 F. Supp. 2d 105, 115 n.12 (D.D.C. 2005)(“[c]ourts have uniformly held that a terrorist attack—by its nature—is directed not only at the victims but also at the victims’ families.”); *Surette v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 231 F. Supp. 2d 260, 267 n.5 (D.D.C. 2002) (treating solatium claim as “‘indistinguishable’ from the claim of intentional infliction of emotional distress.”) (quoting *Wagner v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 172 F. Supp. 2d 128, 135 n.11 (D.D.C. 2001)). Thus, this Court has previously awarded solatium damages to “immediate family members” – that is, the spouses, children, parents and siblings of those killed in the September 11, 2001 Terrorist Attacks (or their functional equivalents), ECF 3363 – who, though not physically present at the site of the terrorist attacks, were nevertheless intended victims of the terrorist activities. *See e.g.* ECF 3396, 3300, 3387, 3394, 3706, 3979, 4052, 4106, 4152, 4170, 4497, 4880, 4902, 5101, 5145, 5920, 5947, 5950, 5976, 7170, 7172, 7190. The four established categories of family relationships – spouses, parents, children and siblings – do not require any additional showing of the nature of the underlying relationship.

To fashion a solatium award adequately compensating the surviving family members in the litigation when issuing solatium damages as against defendant Iran, this Court looked to the analysis undertaken by District Court Judge Royce Lambert in the *Heiser* case. 466 F. Supp. 2d 229. There, Judge Lamberth concluded that solatium damages should be awarded to each spouse of a deceased victim in the amount of \$8 million, to each parent in the amount of \$5 million, and to each sibling in the amount of \$2.5 million. *Id.*

Recognizing that the immediate family members of those killed in the September 11 terrorist attacks suffered and continue to suffer “profound agony and grief and, “[w]orse yet, ... are faced with frequent reminders of the events of that day,” ECF 2618 at 10 – 12, this Court adopted the following solatium damages framework:

Relationship to Decedent	Solatium Award
Spouse	\$12,500,000
Parent	\$8,500,000
Child	\$8,500,000
Sibling	\$4,250,000

The losses claimed in this motion are identical to those that this Court ordered in connection with the final judgment against Iran. The amount of solatium damages previously adopted in the judgments against Iran should apply equally to the *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants.

The relationships between the decedent and the *Ashton* Plaintiffs are set forth in Exhibits B-1 and B-2 accompanying the Maloney Declaration. The *Ashton* Plaintiffs have direct relationships previously recognized as being presumptively qualified for solatium damages; the relationships between the *Ashton* Plaintiffs and the immediate family members killed in the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks have been verified; the *Ashton* Plaintiffs survived the death of their immediate family members on September 11, 2001; the *Ashton* Plaintiffs do not have another known claim pending before this Court for compensation against the *Taliban* or *Omar* Defendants; the *Ashton* Plaintiffs have not recovered against the *Taliban* or *Omar* Defendants; the *Ashton* Plaintiffs have not come close to satisfying their judgments against Iran; and, this Court previously granted solatium damages in the amounts sought here. Maloney Decl. at ¶¶ 14-

The plaintiffs in Exhibits B-1 and B-2 are all individuals who were identified in a complaint against, among others, the Taliban and Omar Mohammad no later than the filing of the Sixth Amended Complaint (the underlying basis for the liability judgment against those defendants); the Sixth Amended Complaint expressly identified claims for solatium damages; and they are the immediate family members of *Ashton* 9/11 Decedents. Maloney Decl. at ¶ 15.

The *Ashton* Plaintiffs therefore respectfully request that this Court issue a final judgment ordering payment of solatium damages to the *Ashton* Plaintiffs listed in Exhibits B-1 and B-2, in the amounts set forth in those exhibits.

D. Treble Damages

As discussed above, for those *Ashton* Plaintiffs set forth in Exhibits A-1 and B-1 who have claims under the Anti-Terrorism Act that this Court has jurisdiction to determine (18 U.S.C. § 2333(a)), they make claims for damages threefold their compensatory damages amounts for pain and suffering and economic loss on behalf of the estates of the *Ashton* 9/11 Decedents (Exhibit A-1) and solatium damages for their immediate family members (Exhibits B-1).

E. Punitive Damages

While *Ashton* Plaintiffs are also entitled to punitive damages, in light of prior differing decisions on the proper punitive multiplier, (*compare, e.g.*, ECF 3175 at 3 *with* ECF 3384 at 6) they request permission to address the issue of punitive damages at a later date, as this Court has previously allowed. ECF No. 3666.

F. Prejudgment Interest

On the issue of prejudgment interest, a December 28, 2015 Report and Recommendation, adopted by this Court, concluded that to the extent the *Ashton* wrongful death plaintiffs' claims arose out of injuries in New York State, the rate of prejudgment interest was 9 percent per annum from September 11, 2001 until the date judgment was entered, and to the extent the injuries arose

elsewhere, 4.96 percent interest per annum compounded annually was appropriate. ECF No. 3175 at 1 – 2. Subsequently, however, this Court concluded that the rate of prejudgment interest of 4.96 percent was more appropriate. ECF No. 3384 at 6.

Accordingly, the *Ashton* Plaintiffs asks that this Court direct that prejudgment interest of 4.96 percent per annum be awarded on their awards running from September 11, 2001 until the date of judgment, as was done previously done in this consolidated litigation.

III. Conclusion

For all of the reasons herein, as well as those set forth in the previous submissions, the *Ashton* Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court grant the proposed order:

1. Awarding each estate of the individuals killed in the September 11 Terrorist Attacks listed in Exhibits A-1 and A-2 damages for conscious pain and suffering against the *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants in the amount of \$2,000,000 per decedent, which is the same amount this Court previously awarded to them, with that amount trebled for the estates listed in Exhibit A-1;

2. Awarding the estates of the *Ashton* 9/11 Decedents damages listed in Exhibits A-1 and A-2 damages for economic loss against the *Taliban* and *Omar* Defendants in the same amounts that this Court previously awarded to them, with that amount trebled for the estates listed in Exhibit A-1;

3. Awarding the immediate family members of the *Ashton* 9/11 Decedents listed in Exhibits B-1 and B-2, who are also named in the complaints as the representatives of the estates of the *Ashton* 9/11 Decedents, solatium damages in the same amounts that this Court has previously awarded to them, with that amount trebled for the plaintiffs listed in B-1;

4. Awarding these plaintiffs pre-judgment interest at the rate of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually for the period from September 11, 2001 until the date of the judgment for damages;

5. Granting the *Ashton* Plaintiffs permission to seek economic damages and punitive damages, to the extent not sought herein, and other appropriate damages at a later date; and

6. Granting permission for any other *Ashton* Plaintiffs to submit applications for damages awards in later stages, to the extent such awards have not previously been addressed.

Dated: New York, New York
July 27, 2022

Respectfully submitted,
KREINDLER & KREINDLER LLP

BY: /s/ Andrew J. Maloney, III
Andrew J. Maloney, III, Esq.
485 Lexington Ave., 28th Floor
New York, New York 10017
Tel: (212) 687-8181
Counsel for Ashton Plaintiffs